Responses to Comments in Letter 1 from Verne Kucy, Manager Environmental Services Division, the Corporation of Delta

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. Thank you for your comment. Figure 3.2-1 in the Final EIS has been changed to reflect the suggested revisions.

2. Thank you for your comment. Tsawwassen has been replaced with Delta on figures and in tables in the Final EIS.

3. The City of Surrey has been included in Figure 3.2-1 and other figures in the Final EIS.

4. Table 3.2-16 in the Draft EIS is correct. For eight-hour carbon monoxide (CO) readings, the maximum concentration of 4.8 micrograms per cubic meter in Canada is 7.8 miles north of the project on the U.S.-Canada border. The maximum CO concentration is projected to be at a slightly different location than that for other pollutants, which are 7.5 miles away from the project.

5. Thank you for your comment. Table 3.2-18 has been revised and the City of Delta now appears in the table.

Response to Comment in Letter 2 from Dr. Mary Lynn Derrington, Superintendent, Blaine School District 503

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. Comment acknowledged.

Responses to Comments in Letter 3 from Sam Crawford, Whatcom County Council Member

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. Comment acknowledged.

2. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the air quality impacts.

3. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the air quality impacts.

4. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the environmental benefits.

5. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the environmental benefits.

6. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the environmental benefits.

7. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the environmental benefits.

8. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the environmental benefits.

9. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the environmental benefits.

10. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the economic benefits.

11. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the economic benefits.

12. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the economic benefits.

13. Thank you for your comment. The description of the No Action Alternative has been revised to reflect the economic benefits.

Responses to Comments in Letter 4 from Wyburn Bannerman, Ferndale Resident

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. Thank you for your comment. It is Bonneville's normal practice to coordinate with landowners during the siting of electrical transmission towers. If new towers are erected as part of the proposed project, the selection of lattice or monopole towers will take into consideration costs, avoidance of natural resources, and landowners' preferences. Also, please refer to Response 4(2) of the Public Meeting comments.

Responses to Comments in Letter 5 from S. Gilfillan

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. Thank you for your comment.

2. Thank you for your comment. Potential impacts on air quality, wetlands, and wildlife habitats were assessed in Sections 3.2, 3.5, and 3.7, respectively, of the Draft EIS. The results of the assessment did not identify significant impacts on these resources. Those impacts that were identified will be mitigated by the Applicant through compliance with the conditions in the Site Certification Agreement and permit conditions approved by federal regulatory agencies, if the project is approved.

Responses to Comments in Letter 6 from Doug Caldwell

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. The commenter indicates that selective catalytic reduction (SCR) technology can be the source of nitrosamines and hydrogen cyanide. The commenter has attached excerpts from a 1989 report indicating that although the production of nitrosamines and hydrogen cyanide is possible if the combustion gases entering the SCR unit contain hydrocarbons, the formation of both cyanide compounds and nitrosamines is extremely unlikely. SCR technology has been in operation for 20 years at facilities all over the world with no indication of safety concerns related to cyanide compounds or nitrosamines. It is the generally accepted control technology of choice for NO_x emissions control for this type of application.

   The commenter's submittal indicates that the emissions control technology manufactured by ISCA Management Ltd. should be chosen over SCR technology because it controls sulfur oxides and heavy metals in addition to NO_x. The choice of emissions control technology is based on rigorous review according to state and federal laws and regulations. Best Available Control Technology (BACT) must be technically feasible and cost-justified. The technology being proposed by ISCA Management Ltd. has not been demonstrated as technically feasible or commercially available on any combustion turbine facility similar in nature or size to this project. The ISCA technology, therefore, would not meet BACT under the requirements of the Prevention of Significant Deterioration program.

Responses to Comments in Letter 7 from H. J. Schneider, Blaine Resident

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. Thank you for your comment. The project would incorporate into the design the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for criteria pollutant emissions.

2. Please refer to General Response A.

3. New transmission lines from the cogeneration facility will connect to Bonneville's existing powerline grid system approximately 0.8 mile east of the facility. No new lines connecting to Vancouver, Canada, will be constructed.

4. Tables 3.2-32 and 3.2-33 in the Final EIS show the worst-case cumulative effect of emissions from the Sumas 2 Project and the proposed BP Cherry Point Cogeneration Project.

5. Thank you for your comment. The proposed project does not include adding transmission lines or "links" between Canada and Anacortes.

Response to Comment in Letter 8 from Todd L. Harrison, WSDOT, Northwest Region/Mount Baker Area

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. The Draft EIS has been revised to reflect that no signal is proposed at the Blaine/Grandview intersection. The Applicant has reached an agreement with WSDOT that a signal will be installed at the intersection of Grandview Road and Portal Way and a left-turn lane will be established from westbound Grandview Road to Blaine Road.

Responses to Comments in Letter 9 from Senator Dale E. Brandland, 42nd District

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. Thank you for your comment.

2. Thank you for your comment.

3. Thank you for your comment.

Responses to Comments in Letter 10 from State Representative Kelli Linville, 42nd District

Note: The responses listed below are numbered to correspond with the numbers shown in the right-hand margin of the preceding comment letter.

1. Thank you for your comment.

2. Thank you for your comment.

3. Thank you for your comment.